

**ICC Docket Nos. 07-0241 and 07-0242**  
**The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company's and**  
**North Shore Gas Company's Response to**  
**People of the State of Illinois Data Requests AG 4.01-4.29**  
**Dated: May 4, 2007**

**REQUEST NO. AG 4.01:**

Please provide, based upon the best available current information gathered by PGL, North Shore and its consultants in this Docket, a listing of each known state jurisdictions and utility proceeding (Docket numbers) within each state that have:

- a. Considered and adopted an energy efficiency cost recovery tracker similar to the proposed EEP.
- b. Considered and rejected an energy efficiency cost recovery tracker similar to EEP.
- c. Considered and adopted an uncollectible cost recovery tracker similar to the proposed UBA.
- d. Considered and rejected an uncollectible cost recovery tracker similar to UBA.
- e. Considered and adopted a decoupling margin recovery tracker similar to the proposed VBA.
- f. Considered and rejected a decoupling margin recovery tracker similar to VBA.
- g. Considered and adopted a weather normalization adjustment tracker that is narrower in scope than the proposed VBA, including and tracking variations in usage caused by weather, but not other changes in usage.
- h. Considered and adopted a plant investment program cost recovery tracker similar to the proposed ICR.
- i. Considered and rejected a plant investment program cost recovery tracker similar to ICR.

**RESPONSE:**

PGL, North Shore and its consultants have not analyzed and examined the history of all utilities to know the background of consideration, approval or rejection of particular cost recovery "trackers" and whether such trackers are "similar" to the cost recovery mechanisms proposed by the Companies. To the extent, however, that the Companies and its consultants are generally aware of rate recovery mechanisms of other utilities that appear to have some similarities to the proposals in the instant case, the responses are as follows:

- a. PGL, North Shore, and its consultants do not maintain the requested information.
- b. PGL, North Shore, and its consultants do not maintain the requested information.
- c. An uncollectible cost recovery mechanism has been considered and adopted in the states of Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio,

OFFICIAL FILE  
ICC DOCKET NO. 07-0241 07-0242  
AG CROSS Exhibit No. 5  
Witness Feingold  
Date 9/11/07 Reporter TO

**ICC Docket Nos. 07-0241 and 07-0242**  
**The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company's and**  
**North Shore Gas Company's Response to**  
**People of the State of Illinois Data Requests AG 4.01-4.29**  
**Dated: May 4, 2007**

Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, and Wyoming. PGL and its consultants do not maintain information on the specific utility proceedings (and docket numbers) in which such ratemaking mechanisms were considered and adopted.

- d. PGL, North Shore, and its consultants do not maintain the requested information.
- e. A revenue decoupling mechanism has been considered and adopted in the states of California, Indiana, Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. The utility proceedings (and docket numbers) in which such ratemaking mechanisms were considered and adopted include:
  - 1. California – Application No. 02-02-012
  - 2. Indiana – IURC Cause No. 42943
  - 3. Maryland – Case No. 8780
  - 4. New Jersey – Docket No. GR05121020
  - 5. North Carolina – Dockets G-9, Sub. 499, G-9, Sub 461, and G-44, Sub 15
  - 6. Ohio – Case No. 05-1444-GA-UNC
  - 7. Oregon – Docket UG-143
  - 8. Utah – Docket No. 05-057-T01
  - 9. Washington – Docket Nos. UG-060518 and UG-060256

In addition, the New York Public Service Commission recently ordered all gas and electric utilities to develop and implement revenue decoupling mechanisms in their ongoing and new rate cases (Cases 03-E-0640 and 06-G-0746). Finally, the Missouri Public Service Commission recently approved the implementation of a straight fixed-variable rate design, which also provides for the decoupling of the utility's sales from its margin revenues, in Cases GR-2006-0387 and GR-2006-0422.

- f. A revenue decoupling mechanism has been considered and rejected in the states of Arizona, Georgia, Indiana, Nevada, and Washington. The utility proceedings (and docket numbers) in which such ratemaking mechanisms were considered and rejected include:
  - 1. Arizona – docket number not available
  - 2. Georgia – docket number not available
  - 3. Indiana – Cause No. 42767
  - 4. Nevada – docket number not available
  - 5. Washington – Docket No. UG-060267
- g. PGL and North Shore object to this part of the data request to the extent that it requests information concerning "weather normalization adjustment trackers", a type of rate recovery mechanism which the Companies have not proposed.

**ICC Docket Nos. 07-0241 and 07-0242**  
**The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company's and**  
**North Shore Gas Company's Response to**  
**People of the State of Illinois Data Requests AG 4.01-4.29**  
**Dated: May 4, 2007**

- h. Please refer to the response to Staff Data Request PL 1.04.
- i. PGL, North Shore, and its consultants do not maintain requested information.

**ICC Docket No. 07-0242**  
**The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company's**  
**Response to Staff Data Requests PL1.01-1.11**  
**Dated: April 9, 2007**

**REQUEST NO. PL 1.04:**

Please answer the following concerning the statement on page 45 of Peoples Gas Ex. RAF-1.0 that "Utility regulators have approved similar infrastructure cost recovery mechanisms for ten (10) gas utilities in the following eight (8) states: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio, Oregon, and Texas":

- a. Please identify each of the ten utilities referenced in this passage.
- b. Please provide a description of each of the recovery mechanisms referenced in this passage.
- c. Please provide the applicable docket number and date of the regulatory commission decision for each of the recovery mechanisms referenced in this passage.
- d. Please provide a copy of all materials available to Mr. Feingold that describe and explain each of the recovery mechanisms referenced in this passage.

**RESPONSE:**

- a. The ten utilities referenced on page 45 of Peoples Gas Ex. RAF-1.0 are:
  1. Atlanta Gas Light Company (AGL Resources)
  2. Arkla (CenterPoint Energy)
  3. United Cities Gas Company (Atmos Energy)
  4. Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company (Duke Energy Ohio)
  5. Laclede Gas Company
  6. Missouri Gas Energy (Southern Union Company)
  7. Mobile Gas Service Corporation (EnergySouth, Inc.)
  8. Northwest Natural
  9. Union Light Heat & Power (Duke Energy Kentucky)
  10. Atmos Energy (Mid-Tex Division)
- b. Please refer to the attached tariff sheets and supporting documentation for a description of the recovery mechanism for each utility listed in the response to part a.
- c. The applicable docket numbers or order numbers and dates of the regulatory commission decisions that are known by Mr. Feingold are provided below.
  1. Atlanta Gas Light Company (AGL Resources) – Order dated September 3, 1998 in Docket No. 8516-U

**ICC Docket No. 07-0242**  
**The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company's**  
**Response to Staff Data Requests PL1.01-1.11**  
**Dated: April 9, 2007**

2. Arkla (CenterPoint Energy) – Order No. 8 dated May 31, 2006 in Docket No. 05-124-U
  3. United Cities Gas Company (Atmos Energy) – Docket No. 12509-U
  4. Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company (Duke Energy Ohio) – Order dated April 19, 2006 in Case Nos. 01-1228-GA-AIR and 01-1539-GA-AAM
  5. Laclede Gas Company – Case No. GO-2003-056
  6. Missouri Gas Energy (Southern Union Company) – Case No. GO-2002-50
  7. Mobile Gas Service Corporation – Docket Nos. 24794 and 28101
  8. Northwest Natural – Order No. 04-390
  9. Union Light Heat & Power (Duke Energy Kentucky) – TFS2006-01494 dated September 29, 2006
  10. Atmos Energy (Mid-Tex Division) – not available
- d. Please refer to the response to part b. for a description and explanation of the recovery mechanism for each utility listed in the response to part a.